

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/029,525 | 12/21/2001 | Jerry T. Pugh | LIFE-037 | 5894 | |
| 24353 7. | 590 04/15/2003 | | | | |
| BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP 200 MIDDLEFIELD RD SUITE 200 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | NOLAND, KENNETH W | | |
| MENLO PARK, CA 94025 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3653 | 3653 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 04/15/2003 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| • • | 10/029,525 | PUGH, JERRY T. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Kenneth w Noland | 3653 | | | | |
| Th MAILING DATE of this communication app | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address - | | | | |
| Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | ely filed swill be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | — · is action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa | | osecution as to the merits is | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) <u>2-14</u> is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers | r election requirement. | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | r | | | | | |
| | | miner | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| a) The translation of the foreign language pro 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting | - · | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 | 5) Notice of Informal F | r (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/029,525

Art Unit: 3653

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all 1.

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahler in

view of Schreiber et al.

Kahler discloses a dispenser for test strips where the dispenser has a moisture-

proof housing to prevent contamination of the strips. The housing is considered the

have a "chamber" (76) which is sealed in a first position by the gasket (74) and which is

opened in a second position to permit the strips to be dispensed. This occurs by a

single motion of the sliding of the mechanism (50). To provide that Kahler would

provide for an analyzing means would be obvious not only as a mere choice to so

provide such analyzing or testing means for the test strips as is conventionally used with

each test strips, but Schreiber et al discloses the use of an analyzing means for use

with a test strip dispenser.

Claims 2-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but 3.

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

4. Stewart is cited showing in figure 1 another type of dispenser using a

reciprocating slider 26.

Noland/kn April 10, 2003

KENNETH W. NOLAND PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 2